

talked to pretty strong pro-lifers who say, I am going to vote, if I have to, for stem cell research. What they do not understand is that stem cell research, whether it is done with embryonic stem cells or adult stem cells, needs somatic nuclear cell transfer research to make it work.

What do Members think is done with a stem cell from an embryo? It needs to be made into the kind of cell that cures these children, and somatic nuclear transfer technology is needed to do it; and if Members kill this substitute, they kill that hope. Please do not do that.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, after 3 hours of debate, I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has finally cleared up one of the principal items we have been debating. He said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) did not bring a bill to the floor to ban stem cell research.

He is right. The Weldon bill does not ban stem cell research. It does not ban it on adult stem cells, it does not ban it on embryonic stem cells, it bans it on cloned stem cells.

This bill is a cloning bill. The substitute amendment is not. It will allow the creation of cloned embryos to be regulated and sold, and once a cloned embryo is implanted into the uterus of a woman and develops into a child, there really is not anything anybody can do about it. So the Weldon substitute has a loophole a mile wide to allow the creation of cloned human beings because they cannot keep track of the cloned embryos that the Weldon bill attempts to regulate. That is the fatal flaw of the Greenwood substitute.

We heard quotes from three of our colleagues 5 years ago when we were debating a Labor-Health and Human Services bill. I have those quotes in front of me. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said, "I agree with our colleagues who say we should not be involved in the creation of embryos for research."

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) said, "No embryos will be created for research purposes."

And the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) said, "Lifting this ban would not allow for the creation of human embryos solely for research purposes."

They were right 5 years ago. We should not be using cloned human embryos for research purposes. I ask Members to vote with them the way they voted 5 years ago and to adhere to that position, because if we do allow cloned human embryos to be used for research purposes, some of them will eventually become human beings.

Mr. Speaker, the way to stop the slippery slope, going down this road into the ethical and moral abyss, is to reject the loophole-filled Greenwood substitute and pass the Weldon bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, finally we have a reasonable approach to prohibiting

human cloning without prohibiting the ability to conduct valuable medical research.

Although H.R. 2505 bans reproductive cloning, it goes too far by banning necessary therapeutic research which could grant new hope to patients who have been told there is no cure for their illnesses. We all agree that reproductive cloning, cloning to produce a pregnancy, should be prohibited. But, in prohibiting reproductive cloning, we must not exclude valuable research cloning that could lead to significant medical advances.

The Greenwood/Deutsch Substitute Amendment narrows the prohibition and focuses on actions which would result in a cloned child by limiting the prohibition to cloning to initiate or the intent to initiate a pregnancy. This would ensure that the cloning of humans is prohibited, while the use of cloning for medical purposes is preserved. The substitute also protects state laws on human cloning that have been enacted prior to the passage of this legislation.

The Greenwood/Deutsch Substitute includes a registration provision for performing a human somatic cell nuclear transfer, so that the Secretary of Health and Human Services is able to monitor the use of the technology and enforce the prohibition against reproductive cloning.

In addition, this substitute would contain a sunset provision as recommended by the National Bioethics Advisory Commission. According to their report, this provision is essential because it guarantees that Congress will return to this issue and reconsider it in light of new scientific advancements.

Finally, the Greenwood/Deutsch substitute includes a study by the Institute of Medicine to review, evaluate, and assess the current state of knowledge regarding therapeutic cloning.

Join me in supporting this logical approach to cloning technology. This substitute takes a narrower approach by simply prohibiting the use or attempted use of DNA transfer technology with intent to initiate a pregnancy. Adopting the Greenwood/Deutsch alternative preserves the scientific use of the embryonic stem cells and at the same time prevents the unsafe practice of human cloning.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2608, the Greenwood-Deutsch Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001, and in opposition to H.R. 2505.

Cloning technology has been the subject of heated debate since 1997, when news of the successful cloning of Dolly the sheep rocked the scientific community. The resulting ethical discussions have raised many important questions of scientific development. Perhaps the most important discussions have centered on the lengths to which science can and should go in the future. What remained true throughout the debate, however, is that the vast majority of the American public vehemently opposes the creation of cloned human beings. The Greenwood-Deutsch bill respects that feeling to the utmost.

H.R. 2608 would criminalize reproductive cloning of human beings while simultaneously protecting the rights of scientists to perform somatic cell nuclear transfer. Somatic cell nuclear transfer is a technology that holds great promise for medicine by permitting the creation of stem cells that are genetically identical to the donor. This is valuable because many of the potential medical therapies involving stem cells could be stymied when the immune

systems of therapy recipients reject the transferred tissue. Using cloning technology to create stem cells could circumvent this problem. Newly cloned nerve cells, for example, could be used to treat patients with neural degeneration without concern for rejection because the cells would be genetically identical to those already in the brain.

Opponents of this technology repeatedly claim that any therapies involving cloning are merely hypothetical. In this they are absolutely correct. These treatments are hypothetical today, but therapies for Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and a myriad of other diseases will only remain so if this research is banned, as it is in H.R. 2505, the underlying bill.

In addition to preventing this promising research, the underlying bill would prohibit the importation of the products of clonal research. Such a ban would force the scientific community to turn its back on therapies developed abroad. It would deny the American people promising new therapies available elsewhere for which there may be no alternate treatment.

At some point in our lives, most of us will be touched in some way by Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's Disease, spinal cord injury, Juvenile Diabetes, and other maladies for which this technology holds promise. How can we stand in the way of scientific research that has the potential to cure these afflictions? I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute, and against the underlying bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to House Resolution 214, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 249, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—178

Ackerman	Boehlert	Condit
Allen	Bono	Conyers
Andrews	Boswell	Coyne
Baca	Boucher	Crowley
Baird	Boyd	Cummings
Baldacci	Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)
Barrett	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Bass	Capps	DeGette
Becerra	Capuano	DeLauro
Bentsen	Cardin	Deutsch
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Dicks
Berman	Castle	Dingell
Biggert	Clay	Doggett
Blagojevich	Clayton	Dooley
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Engel